

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Board decision dated December 14, 2007. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Board decision (page 13) affirmed the Examiner's rejection of claim 7 and 15; and reversed the Examiner's rejection of claims 8 and 9. Further, in the Office Action dated August 25, 2005, the Examiner indicated that claims 10-14 and 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Accordingly, the above amendment is submitted to place the application in condition for allowance. Note that each of independent claims 7, 13, 14 and 16 includes subject matter considered allowable by the Examiner or the Board. In particular:

*Claim 7 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 8 (now cancelled);*

*Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form so as to include the limitations of base claim 7;*

*Claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form so as to include the limitations of base claim 7; and*

*Claim 16 been rewritten in independent form so as to include the limitations of base claim 7 and intervening claim 15 (now cancelled).*


Further, the remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the allowable independent claims, and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Per ALMDAHL et al.

By: 

Michael S. Huppert  
Registration No. 40,268  
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
February 11, 2008